DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 085 SP 033 851

AUTHOR Tierney, Dennis S.; McKibbin, Michael
TITLE Strengths and Weaknesses in California Teacher Education Programs: A Three Year Review.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Accrediting Agencies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Financial Needs; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Interviews; Program Administration; Program Effectiveness; *Quality Control; *State Standards; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *California Commission on Teacher Credentialing; Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on results of three years (1988-1991) of state mandated external reviews of basic credential programs (elementary and secondary) at 33 California institutions of higher education. The review used teams of teacher educators, school administrators, classroom teachers, and other stakeholders to identify common strengths and weaknesses of teacher education programs. Responding to reform efforts, the teams examined institutional documents and interviewed program faculty, cooperating school district personnel, current students, recent graduates, and area employers based on 32 standards of program quality in five categories: (1) institutional resources and coordination; (2) field experiences; (3) curriculum; (4) candidate competence and performance; and (5) admissions and student services. This paper also raises questions about the ability of teacher education programs effectively to answer demands for change in light of limited resources and persistent university values. Policy issues related to the needs of teacher education programs generated by reform efforts are discussed and suggestions are made regarding persistent management problems in difficult times. A list of standards (by category) developed by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing is appended. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Strengths and Weaknesses in California Teacher Education Programs: A Three Year Review

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Dennis S. Tierney
Senior Research Associate
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

Michael McKibbin
Consultant, Professional Services
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dennis Tierney
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED346085

Overview

This paper reports the results of three years (1988 -1991) of state mandated external reviews of basic credential programs (elementary and secondary) at 33 institutions of higher education using teams of university teacher educators, classroom teachers, school administrators, and other stakeholders. These teams examined institutional documents, interviewed program faculty, cooperating school district personnel, current students, recent graduates, and area employers using 32 standards of program quality (1988) that were developed by a broad array of educators in California during 1985 - 1988. These standards were designed to respond to the concerns raised in the series of national and state reports on reform in education and teacher education beginning with "A Nation at Risk"(1983) and culminating in California's own effort entitled "Who Will Teach Our Children" (1985).

In addition to demonstrating the ways in which the teacher education programs in California have responded to external requirements, this paper also raises questions about the ability of teacher education programs to effectively answer demands for change in light of limited resources and persistent university values. Policy issues related to the needs of teacher education programs newly generated by reform efforts will be discussed and suggestions will be made regarding these persistent problems in managing credential programs in difficult times.

Introduction

The quality of the nation's teachers remains a critical issue in the on-going debate over how best to improve our nation's schools. From the publication of "A Nation at Risk"(1983), policymakers and others have decried the poor quality of the individuals drawn to teaching (Schlecty & Vance, 1983) and the poor quality of the teacher education programs that prepared them (Sykes, 1983). California, like many other states, engaged in a somewhat connected set of reform efforts during the decade of the Eighties intended to produce stronger teacher education programs and, in turn, stronger schools. "Who Will Teach Our Children" (1985) represented one strand of educational reform and the development of new standards for approving and evaluating teacher

SP033851

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

education programs by the independent Commission on Teacher Credentialing (1988) provided another strand. The redesign effort by the Commission was an acknowledgement that earlier notions of quality control in credential programs were clearly inadequate and required significant change if teacher preparation was to respond to the calls for reform.

As Galluzzo and Craig (1990) note in their article on evaluating preservice teacher education programs, state accrediting agencies have typically focused on easily determined elements of program evaluation such as number of hours of student teaching or number of course work units required before certification. Such a compliance orientation typified California's independent Commission on Teacher Credentialing until 1988. Although California required post-baccalaureate course work as early as the 1920's (1977) and abolished the the undergraduate degree in education by 1962, the oversight of teacher education programs was handled through paper reviews and perfunctory site visits, largely by state department of education employees. Under the influence of the spate of national and state reform efforts regarding teacher preparation, the Commission undertook a multi-year effort to re-define the basic standards that would govern the operation of approved teacher education programs. This effort at re-definition was intended to provide not only greater programmatic and curricular flexibility for individual programs but also to raise the minimum expectations contained in the standards and base them on the emerging research base for teacher preparation. It also changed the nature of the institution of higher education - state regulatory agency relationship. Instead of prescribing course content and hours of practice teaching without reference to the quality of the content or the value of the hours, the move to standards facilitated assessment practices that attempted to foster diversity of approach and innovation within the standards. Inviting the input from over a thousand educators from every stakeholder group in California and experts from around the nation, 32 general standards of program quality for the basic teaching credentials were written and approved (See Appendix). These standards were applicable to both elementary and secondary credential programs and focused on the professional education sequence required for initial certification. Content knowledge (course work in the subject or subjects to be taught) was governed by a different set of requirements and subject matter competence was assumed

prior to beginning student teaching. These standards were grouped into five categories:

I. Institutional Resources and Coordination
II. Admission and Student Services
III. Curriculum
IV. Field Experiences
V. Candidate Competence and Performance

The first four categories, standards 1 through 20, are input variables that, if present, should enable the graduates of such a program to perform well as classroom teachers. Category I identifies organizational structure and support standards that explicate the need for a program rationale, identifies a coordinator or director of the program, ensures sufficient institutional attention and resources exist to permit the program to meet all other standards, that faculty selection and evaluation practices ensure only competent individuals instruct in the program, and program evaluation practices that clearly demonstrate an on-going review process that contributes to program improvement. Category II continues the focus on organizational structure and support through admission standards that indicate the program is taking candidates from top half of their identified applicant pool and who possess other characteristics that are likely to make them successful teachers (specific characteristics are not mentioned), that program information is available to all, and that program advisement and placement services are available to all students (this is particularly important for off-campus programs). Categories III and IV contain the standards that indicate required elements of the basic credential curriculum and the required field experiences. Since some of the restrictions on teacher education program are embedded in California law, most of these standards are rather general. One calls for course work to precede student teaching, one requires some attention to foundational studies, while the last two curricular standards require study in human development and equity and multicultural education, including second language acquisition. The standards for field experiences detail collaboration with local districts, some early field experience before formal student teaching, a formal review before advancement to student teaching, training and recognition of cooperating teachers, field experiences in diverse schools and classrooms (this

includes grade level, subject level, socio-economic and ethnic diversity), an formative and summative feedback during student teaching. The last category - standards 21 through 32 are outcome standards based on a general review of the skills and abilities associated with competent teachers.

The list of competencies is largely based on the process-product research and effective schools research and is not empirically based on research specific to student teachers. Moreover, while the Commission on Teacher Credentialing has identified a list of competencies that is generally well accepted as important one for teachers to possess, there is no clearly stated state-level criteria for determining if the candidate has demonstrated a sufficient level of competence to warrant a recommendation for a credential. Thus, the program evaluation system is not intended to attempt actual assessments of graduates' abilities as classroom teachers (no visits to graduates' classrooms are conducted). Nonetheless, the standards do require some inferential evaluation of the program's probable success in imparting such skills and abilities to program participants. It should also be noted that remnants of the old compliance mind-set exist in restrictive law that prohibits basic credential programs from taking more than one year of full-time study and requiring that half of that one year program be field work. Thus, the "box" of state oversight imposed by the Legislature currently exists as an unhappy counterpoint to the efforts at moving toward standards for teacher education. In addition to the standards themselves, the Commission developed "Factors to Consider" for each standard. These are statements of how a program might meet the standard. Institutions are not required to meet the standard through any or all of the "factors to consider," but most institutions select one or more of the factors as responses to the standard. Their value is as guides for institutions seeking means of addressing the standards that are likely to pass muster and as guides for evaluation team members looking for likely examples. The danger is that some institutions and team members will interpret them as "mini-standards" and apply each "factor to consider" as a required part of the actual standard.

When institutions are scheduled for an evaluation visit (California currently operates on a six year evaluation schedule for all 72 institutions with approved credential programs), they prepare a document for each approved credential

program which provides a narrative response to each standard and indicates lines of evidence that will be available to demonstrate how they are meeting the standards. Each credential program also assembles its faculty, students, graduates, cooperating teachers, local administrators, and other involved stakeholders for interviews during the evaluation visit. These three general kinds of evidence - programmatic response to the standards, documents held on campus, and interviews with knowledgeable individuals - all are used by the evaluation team to make its judgment about the program. Rather than the determination that an institutional response exists or not (the compliance model), the use of program standards requires teams to follow Stake's (1967) Countenance Model in which the professional judgment of fellow educators is based on as much descriptive information as can be obtained through document review and interviews. During a three day evaluation visit, teams will generally interview all faculty, and representative samples of students, graduates, cooperating teachers, employers of graduates, and other knowledgeable individuals. In the 1988-90 period, a typical evaluation team member for the basic credential program conducted 40 interviews (some individual and some group lasting as long as 30 minutes each) and evaluated over 25 different documents. The thrust of these interviews is to determine if the interviewee's experience with the program supports the claims made about the program's response to the 32 standards. The exact nature of the questions depends on the knowledge level of the interviewee. Students are asked different questions than graduates and faculty.

The program evaluation team is composed of at least two members and at least two stakeholder groups are represented on each team (e.g., classroom teachers, administrators, teacher education college faulty, interested citizens). Credential programs with large enrollments may have as many as four team members and some closely related credential programs (e.g., special education learning handicapped and severely handicapped) may have a combined team of three or four individuals. The principal purpose of having fellow educators perform the assessment is to ensure that the individuals most affected by teacher education program quality and those who are most knowledgeable about teacher education issues should be the judges of program quality. Prospective team members are expected to make a summative evaluation for each of the 32 standards based on the cumulative weight of the evidence

generated through document review and interviews with knowledgeable persons. Team members are taught to think of their work in terms similar to civil law judgments where the burden is to find that the weight of the evidence is greater in one direction than another. The burden is not to make a finding beyond a shadow of doubt. The training for these team members has been limited until 1990 when more extensive formal training was instituted, but about half of the team members are drawn from other teacher education programs in California and, thus, should be knowledgeable about teacher education issues and research. Prior to the formal training activities, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing prepared written materials about program evaluation practices which were used in team briefings before the visit began.

Team members are required to judge each standard as being fully met, partially met, marginally met, or not met. The difference between marginally met and partially met is largely quantitative. Several standards embrace more than one concept or activity. In those situations where the team believes the standard is being well met in all but one area, it may choose to find the standard partially met. In those circumstances where the entire standard is being addressed but, in the team's judgment, the standard is poorly addressed, the decision is likely to be marginally met. Standards judged by a team as not met are those where the team has substantial evidence of an unacceptably poor institutional response to the standard or verifiable serious concerns raised by a number of stakeholder groups about that standard or standards. It is not sufficient for an institution to claim it is making an appropriate response; the team must have corroborative evidence in the form of testimony or documents from knowledgeable persons about the program. Teams are required to prepare specific statements in their final report to the institution about the evidence base for a standard judged as less than fully met and particularly for those standards judged as simply not met.

In addition to making judgments about each individual standard, the team also makes an overall recommendation to the state agency regarding a general approval rating. Here the choices are Approval, Approval with Conditions, Probation, and Termination. Approval requires that all standards be met in some fashion and that the program be judged as effective overall. It does not

require that all standards be fully met as program vary in strength and focus so that significant performance in one area can compensate for small deficiencies in other areas. Approval with Conditions requires that all standards be met at some level, but indicates that some program areas require attention. Typically, programs are given up to one calendar year to improve in the areas noted and a re-visit is scheduled to ensure that the deficiencies have been removed. Probation is recommended when one or more standards are not met or there is a strong pattern of deficiencies that raise concerns about the competence of the program's graduates. About 16% of credential programs in California during the years of this study received Probation. Programs placed on Probation have one year to remove all deficiencies and must announce publicly that the program has been placed on Probation. Termination has been recommended only a few times since this system was instituted, but is reserved for those programs where two or more standards are not met and there is serious concern about graduate competence. Such programs must cease admitting students and arrange for current students to transfer to other programs.

To assist teams in making the summary recommendation, the Commission has designated some standards as critical standards. Failure to meet these standards triggers an automatic recommendation of Probation. Critical standards outnumber non-critical standards by a large margin. Of the 32 standards, only 8 are non-critical. Standard #2, Institutional Attention to Program and Standards #5 through #11, Faculty Evaluation and Development, Program Evaluation and Development, and the entire Category of Admission and Student Services standards comprise the non-critical standards. When all the standards are met in some fashion, but are not fully met, the Commission has prepared no decision rules for teams. The driving force should be the overall quality of the program and the probable competence of program graduates. Such a system places a substantial burden on the team members who must weight all the evidence, consider the source of the evidence, and try to make inferential judgments about the probable success of program graduates on the basis of interviews with graduates and with employers of graduates.

While few programs have been terminated under this system, the unfavorable publicity that attends a recommendation of Probation and even the campus

political fallout from a recommendation of Approval with Conditions makes the stakes of such an external review quite high. Such negative ratings (including Approval with Conditions) have significant implications for program continuance and public awareness of program strength. Teams, on occasion, have to deal with difficult emotions during the visit and must not allow appeals or veiled allusions of reprisals if the review goes badly to sway their work. In addition, teams cannot allow personal bias or information gained outside the actual review process to influence their judgments.

Finally, teams are encouraged to make general comments on program strengths and weaknesses that go beyond the specific standards set by the state. These written comments may be issues that transcend specific standards or may reflect comments made by interviewees or observations made by team members. For institutions that receive an overall recommendation of Approval, such comments can be enormously helpful as they provide the basis for dialogue about making a good program even better. The earlier methods of program evaluation allowed for no such encouragement of programs that met the minimum standard. Such comments, however, are advisory and require no formal response from the institution when the report is filed with the Commission.

Methods

The paper describes the overall performances of the 33 institutions evaluated using this system and identifies the common strengths and weaknesses by standards most often judged met, partially met, marginally met, and not met. Simple descriptive statistics are used to give some sense of the areas of greatest weakness. Summaries of team comments on program strengths and weaknesses are made to provide some insight into the contextual issues that informed the teams' judgments. Since some credential programs still operate under the compliance model regulations and guidelines, it is the basic elementary and secondary teaching credential programs that will be discussed. It is also important to note that the program evaluation system does not evaluate program graduates directly. It is the degree to which the credential program can demonstrate through documents and interviews that it meets the understood intent of the adopted standards of program quality and

effectiveness that is assessed. Since the work of the evaluation teams is qualitative in nature and thus prone to human error and bias, regardless of the training provided, issues of quality and effectiveness not addressed by the teams or that lie outside the standards themselves may not be acknowledged. Moreover, while the standards of program quality and effectiveness overlap standards adopted by other professional organizations and accrediting bodies, they are particular to California. Generalizing about all teacher education programs from this state-level study is difficult and requires a great many caveats.

Results

General Performance

In 1988-89, during the initial year that programs in elementary and secondary education had to respond to the new 32 standards of program quality and effectiveness, only 47% of the programs were recommended for Approval. In comparison to that initial changeover year, by 1989-90 67% of programs received an overall recommendation of Approval while in 1990-91, 73% of programs received a recommendation of Approval. On the negative view, although only 3% of programs received a recommendation of probation in 1988-89, 15% of the programs were placed on probation in 1990 while only 4% of programs were placed on probation in 1991. The percentage of programs receiving the Approval with Conditions recommendation was 50% in the changeover year of 1988-89, dropped to 16% in 1989-90 and rose to 23% in 1990-91. No programs were terminated during the time of this study.

Performance by Categories

Over the three years in the study, the rank order of categories for elementary and secondary credential programs with the most standards not fully met was as follows:

Category I - Institutional Resources and Co-ordination	40%
Category IV - Field Experiences	19%
Category III - Curriculum	18%
Category V - Candidate Competence and Performance	12%
Category II - Admissions and Student Services	10%

Categories of Standards not Fully Met 1988-1990

Category(#)	88-89 N=25	89-90 N=31	90-91 N=29	TOTAL(N=85)
Category I (6)	27	37	33	97
Category II(5)	09	15	01	25
Category III(4)	14	18	12	44
Category IV(6)	16	19	11	46
Category V(11)	19	11	00	30

Performance by Standards

In addition to examining how well basic credential programs (elementary, elementary with bilingual emphasis, and secondary credentials) did in meeting the 32 standards, the individual team reports were analyzed to determine which individual standards were most often not fully met.

The standards most often judged not met or not fully met by evaluation teams for the elementary and secondary programs (N= 85) visited over the three year period were:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Standards Judged Not Fully Met	# of Times
# 6 Program Evaluation and Program Development	27
#15 Preparation of Candidates in Multicultural Education	25
#3 Resources Allocated to Program	25
#1 Program Design, Rationale, and Coordination	22
#30 Capacity of Graduates to Teach Diverse Students	15
#16 Collaboration with Local Educators	14
#2 Institutional Attention to the Program	13
#12 Preparation for Teaching Responsibilities	13
#19 Qualifications and Recognition of Cooperating Teachers	13
#20 Guidance, Assistance, and Feedback	13
#5 Faculty Evaluation and Development	12
#10 Candidate Advisement and Placement	10

All other standards were not fully met fewer than 10 times over the three year period. Only one standard was met by all 85 programs evaluated over the three year period and that was Standard #8 Admission of Candidates: Pre-professional Qualifications.

Interpretation of Results

General Performance

The shift in overall recommendations across the three year period may be due to the rising expectation that programs should be meeting the new standards. The institutions that happened to be scheduled for the 1988-89 program evaluation cycle did have a harder task and while the program in that year had the lowest rate of Approval, they also had the lowest rate of Probation recommendations. The programs evaluated in the next cycle had a higher rate of Approval, but the highest rate of Probation recommendations by a significant amount. The Probation rate quintupled during that year while, at the same time, the percentage of Approval recommendations also jumped from 47% to 67%. The teams conducting program reviews in this year appeared to be more demanding of institutions given the additional time they had to

prepare for these new standards, based on the team comments made in the report themselves. That is not to argue that the teams applied more vigorous interpretations of the standards. Rather, the teams found that the institutions evaluated did not respond adequately to the new requirements by the time the teams arrived on the campus. By 1990-91, the percentage of Approval recommendations rose to 73% and the percentage of Probation recommendations dropped back to 4%. The rise in the number of Approval with Conditions recommendations reveals that the institutions are making a good faith effort to implement all the standards, but that some appear to be more difficult to achieve than others.

Performance by Categories

Category I - Institutional Resources and Coordination leads the list not only for the three year period, but also for each year in the study. Indeed, this single category represents almost half the standards not fully met by basic credential programs in the study. Standards #6, #3, #1, #2, and #5 represent the category with Standard #6 as the most often missed standard within this category. Teams appear to be able to make clear determinations in this Category as all the data are on campus and the most knowledgeable individuals about this Category are the faculty who receive individual interviews by the evaluation team. Since all these standards are about institutional support for the program and the program's attention to on-going evaluation and development, the persistence of problems identified by teams across the 33 institutions in the study is a significant one and warrants further investigation. It is true that for state institutions in California, budget cutbacks in the past decade have contributed to crisis conditions. A number of the standards, however, do not have clear budget implications and may reflect attitudes of isolation and disconnection from the research community.

Categories III and IV are close together, representing together 37% of all the standards not fully met in this study. These two categories reveal on-going concerns in the curriculum and field work area. Category V, the section of the standards that addresses Candidate Competence and Performance represents 12% of the standards which seems odd given that the Curriculum and Field Experiences Categories have a number of standards not fully met. If the

Candidates are perceived as competent, but there are noted problems in the curriculum and field experience, it seems unlikely that competence arrived without benefit of curriculum and guided field experience. To do so would be to suggest that the candidates came with competence and gained nothing by their experience. A review of the comments on program strengths and weaknesses suggests that the team members do not feel able to make tough judgments about candidate competence in the absence of any serious observation of candidate performance. Forced to base their decisions on the statements of graduates (who, according to CTC records represent the smallest number of interviews conducted during CTC program evaluations) and employers of graduates, the teams appear to make only those judgments where the data are very clear. In cases where the information is mixed or muted, teams give institutions the benefit of the doubt.

Category II - Admission and Student Services is the category with the fewest number of standards not fully met. California has made significant strides in improving its admissions policies and the ease with which all institutions have met the admission criteria suggests that the presumed problem of academically impoverished students entering teacher education was not as great as some believed. A few programs, particularly those with off-campus programs appear to have difficulties with providing adequate advisement and placement services, but the bulk of teacher education programs appear to have no difficulty in maintaining an acceptable level of services even when they are at risk in other organizational areas. This dichotomy may arise from differences in who handles placement, advisement, and other student services. In institutions where such services are handled centrally, it is quite possible that the teacher education program could be poorly provisioned while the student services were well staffed and supported.

Performance by Standard

Two of these standards, #15 and #30, are related elements as #15 focuses on the curriculum in the program that addresses multicultural education and second language acquisition and #30 is an outcome standard that requires the graduate to be able to teach diverse students. Diversity is expected to include ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences. it is odd

that the two standards, although conceptually linked, are not equally missed. It appears that teams find it much easier to identify gaps or problems in the curriculum than they do in the competence of the graduates. As noted earlier, some of the difference may be attributed to the relatively low number of interviews done with program graduates while current students in the evaluated program comprise the largest number of interviews. Given the astonishing diversity of California's classrooms, both the focus of the state licensing agency and the difficulties of the teacher education programs in properly addressing these standards is understandable. Many well-meaning programs may have difficulty in seriously addressing the complex and poorly understood issues surrounding linguistic impact on learning and the seemingly intractable problems of race and ethnicity. Nonetheless, these findings raise concerns about responsiveness to changing work conditions and the relevancy of the teacher education programs in California.

Standards #1, #3, and #6 raise serious concerns about the organizational and managerial structure that undergirds teacher preparation programs. As noted earlier, the increasing budget problems of many state and private colleges and universities in California may account for some of the problems with Standard #3, but the problems noted with Standard #1 - Program Design, Rationale and Coordination appear to reflect the problems that NCATE has had with the knowledge base for teacher education. A number of programs do not have a clearly articulated philosophy or theoretical approach that is well understood by the students and that permeates the curriculum. Some programs, particularly those that are taught off-campus by small groups of faculty can and do vary substantially in focus, philosophy, and content. The problems associated with Standard #6 - Program Evaluation and Development are the most disconcerting. The failure to engage in the serious, on-going evaluation of a teacher education program calls into question the program and its faculty. One would expect that a professional program of study with, essentially, one employer for its graduates would be very close to the field and very attentive to changes in practice. Although many programs do appear to evaluate themselves through some questionnaire process, teams during the three year period have routinely determined that little is done with the data collected and that the faculty cannot point to improvement or changes made in the program as a result of their efforts at evaluation and development. Coupled with the

failure of some institutions to properly collaborate with local educators - Standard #16, this persistence about "business as usual" gives a clearer indication as to the belief that teacher education programs are part of the problem and not part of the solution.

Teacher education faculty do not operate independent of institutional restraints and campus politics. Unlike many other academic programs, teacher credential programs require significant daily management to be successful. In California, the current admission review requirements and processes make teacher education programs the most complex to enter on the campus. As well meaning legislators and policymakers add requirements and competencies, the need for very careful and specific advisement increases. Most teacher education programs in California find that demand for information and assistance is year-round while colleges and universities are still funded on a traditional academic calendar. The failure of so many programs to meet relatively modest standards regarding program design and coordination, resource allocation, and program evaluation suggests a continuance of the "cash cow" view of education programs and a refusal of institutions of higher education to put resources and rewards into the operation of their credential programs. Several team reports indicate that the program's quality is due to the dedication and extra effort of program faculty rather than systematic support by the host institution. A few team reports also suggest that some faculty abuse the notion of academic freedom by declining to cover materials in their class sections that are covered in other sections of the same required course. While faculty are entitled to cover material in a manner suitable to their instructional preferences, it is also true that all teacher education programs are obligated to cover certain mandated subjects and topics as dictated by the Legislature or,in California, by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. For example, by act of the Legislature all teacher education programs in California must teach basic theories and techniques for teaching reading. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing has required all teacher education programs to cover topics of human development and studies of equity in the basic credential program. Assuring that all credential candidates have been exposed to the adopted curriculum, particularly in those areas of second language acquisition and multicultural education, may require modifications in faculty behavior and, possibly, faculty evaluation. This is

particularly difficult in the face of serious budget cuts that public (and private) institutions in California are facing. However, students expect that they will receive a quality program that adheres to the standards established by the state agency charged with setting standards for teaching licenses. No institution of higher education is entitled to offer teacher education programs. If the appropriate funds cannot be found to support the program, it should be closed.

Conclusion

The continuing demand for improvement in teacher education programs may force a closer look at the interior organization and management of such programs. This multi-year review of the state evaluation process in California, the largest state, suggests that some of the on-going weaknesses lie in the ability of the faculty to adapt to rapidly changing circumstances and in some structural weaknesses identified in the current program review process. To remedy these two principal concerns may well require additional resources at the very time most states find themselves struggling to maintain basic services. Other shortcomings identified by professional peers through this program evaluation process will require a re-commitment to provisioning basic teacher education programs with sufficient faculty and staff and then demanding that the program faculty engage in serious reflective practice about their own work. The persistent failure to adequately document program evaluation and development within teacher education programs gives powerful ammunition to those who see teacher education as part of the problem. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing must revisit its standards and its procedures for obtaining information about the program from graduates to ensure that the claims made by the standards in Category V can be reliably supported by the individuals who actually do the evaluations. Finally, the evolving relationship between teacher education programs and the state licensing agency must continue and both groups must avoid positional bargaining through the state Legislature to advance their authority at the expense of the other party. Both must see the other as ally and advocate for excellence in teacher preparation and work collaboratively to improve the standards in ways that are cognizant of beginning teacher competence. Some might well argue that the move to candidate centered assessment will solve all

the problems associated with intrusive site reviews. The evidence from those states conducting such efforts suggests that such evaluation programs are far in the future and too expensive when done well. Given the probable delay in adopting any useful system in the near term, it is all the more crucial for all teacher educators to work toward improving existing systems of credential program evaluation. To do less is to ensure that more policymakers will look beyond departments and schools of teacher education for the solutions to our nation's educational challenges.

Bibliography

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. (1985). Who will teach our children? Sacramento, CA: Author.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1989). Program evaluation summary and analysis for 1988-89. August, 1989. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1990). Program evaluation summary and analysis for 1989-90. September, 1990. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1991). Program evaluation summary and analysis for 1990-91. June, 1991. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Galluzzo, G.R. & Craig, J.R. (1990). Evaluation of preservice teacher education programs. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching and teacher education (pp. 599-616). New York: Macmillan Press.

Lyons, E.W. (1977) The history of pomona college, 1887-1969. Pomona, California: The Castle Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Schlecty, P.C. & Vance, V.S. (1983) Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. Elementary School Journal, 83, 469-487.

Stake, R.E. (1967) The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record, 68(7), 523-540.

Sykes. G. (1983). Public policy and the problem of teacher quality: The need for screens and magnets. In L.S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 95-125). New York: Longman.

Category I

Institutional Resources and Coordination

Standard 1 Program Design, Rationale and Coordination

Each program of professional preparation is coordinated effectively in accordance with a cohesive design that has a cogent rationale.

Standard 2 Institutional Attention to the Program

The institution gives ongoing attention to the effective operation of each program, and resolves each program's administrative needs promptly.

Standard 3 Resources Allocated to the Program

The institution annually allocates sufficient resources to enable each program to fulfill the Standards in Categories I through V.

Standard 4 Qualifications of Faculty

Qualified persons teach all courses and supervise all field experiences in each program of professional preparation.

Standard 5 Faculty Evaluation and Development

The institution evaluates regularly the quality of courses and field experiences in each program, contributes to faculty development, recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching in the program, and retains in the program only those instructors and supervisors who are consistently effective.

Standard 6 Program Development and Evaluation

The institution operates a comprehensive, ongoing system of program development and evaluation that involves program participants and local practitioners, and that leads to substantive improvements in each program. The program provides opportunities for meaningful involvement by diverse community members in program development and evaluation decisions.

Category II

Admission and Student Services

Standard 7 Admission of Candidates: Academic Qualifications

As a group, candidates admitted into the program each year have attained the median or higher in an appropriate comparison population on one or more indicators of academic achievement selected by the program.

Standard 8 Admission of Candidates: Pre-professional Qualifications

Before admitting candidates into the program, the institution determines that each individual has personal qualities and preprofessional experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional success and effectiveness as a teacher.

Standard 9 Availability of Program Information

The program informs each candidate about (a) all requirements, standards and procedures that affect candidates' progress toward certification; and (b) all individuals, committees and offices that are responsible for operating each program component.

Standard 10 Candidate Advisement and Placement

Qualified members of the institution's staff are assigned and available to advise candidates about their academic, professional and personal development as the need arises, and to assist in their professional placement.

Standard 11 Candidate Assistance and Retention

The institution identifies and assists candidates who need academic, professional or personal assistance. The program retains only those candidates who are suited to enter the teaching profession and who are likely to attain the Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance in Category V.

Category III

Curriculum

Standard 12 Preparation for Teaching Responsibilities

Prior to assuming daily student teaching responsibilities, each candidate in the program has adequate opportunities to acquire knowledge and skills that underlie the Standards of Competence and Performance in Category V. The Program offers adequate opportunities to learn knowledge and skills that are pertinent to Standards 22 through 30 as they relate to the teaching of (a) subjects to be authorized by the credential, and (b) communication skills including reading.

Standard 13 Development of Professional Perspectives

Prior to or during the program, each candidate studies essential themes, concepts and skills related to the subject(s) to be taught, including knowledge of the history and traditions of the field, its role in the curriculum of public education, and ethical issues embedded in it. Each candidate develops a professional perspective by examining contemporary schooling policies and teaching practices in relation to fundamental issues, theories and research in education.

Standard 14 Orientation to Human Development and Equity

Prior to or during the program, each candidate is oriented to common traits and individual differences that characterize children and adolescents during several periods of development. Each candidate examines principles of educational equity and analyzes the implementation of those principles in curriculum content and instructional practices.

Standard 15 Preparation for Multicultural Education

Prior to or during the program, each candidate engages in multicultural study and experience, including study of second language acquisition and experience with successful approaches to the education of linguistically different students.

Category IV

Field Experiences

Standard 16 **Collaboration with Local Educators**

The institution collaborates with local school administrators and teachers in the selection of excellent training schools and supervising teachers, and in the placement of candidates in appropriate field settings.

Standard 17 **Field Experience Prior to Student Teaching**

Before assuming daily student teaching responsibilities, each candidate in the program has one or more supervised field experiences that (a) relate to the candidate's professional goals, (b) provide opportunities to interrelate theories and practices, (c) prepare the candidate for daily teaching responsibilities, and (d) enable the program staff to determine when the candidate is ready for daily teaching duties.

Standard 18 **Advancement to Daily Student Teaching Responsibilities**

In each program, advancement to daily student teaching responsibilities is limited to candidates who are ready for such responsibilities, have demonstrated proficiency at basic academic skills, and have either (a) attained the Commission's standard for advancement on the relevant subject matter examination approved by the Commission, or (b) completed at least four-fifths of a program of subject matter preparation that waives this examination.

Standard 19 **Qualifications and Recognition of Supervising Teachers**

Each classroom teacher who supervises one or more student teachers is (a) certified and experienced in teaching the subject(s) of the class; (b) trained in supervision and oriented to the supervisory role; and (c) appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the institution.

Standard 20 **Guidance, Assistance and Feedback**

Throughout the course of student teaching, each candidate's performance is guided, assisted and evaluated in relation to each Standard in Category V by at least one supervising teacher and at least one institutional supervisor, who provide complete, accurate and timely feedback to the candidate.

Standard 21 **Readiness for Diverse Responsibilities**

Each candidate teaches students of diverse ages and abilities, and assumes other responsibilities of full-time teachers. The program provides a well developed rationale for the sequence of field experiences. Each candidate has at least one field experience in a public school.

Category V

Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 22 Student Rapport and Classroom Environment

Each candidate establishes and sustains a level of student rapport and a classroom environment that promotes learning and equity, and that fosters mutual respect among the persons in a class.

Standard 23 Curricular and Instructional Planning Skills

Each candidate prepares at least one unit plan and several lesson plans that include goals, objectives, strategies, activities, materials and assessment plans that are well defined and coordinated with each other.

Standard 24 Diverse and Appropriate Teaching

Each candidate prepares and uses instructional strategies, activities and materials that are appropriate for students with diverse needs, interests and learning styles.

Standard 25 Student Motivation, Involvement and Conduct

Each candidate motivates and sustains student interest, involvement and appropriate conduct equitably during a variety of class activities.

Standard 26 Presentation Skills

Each candidate communicates effectively by presenting ideas and instructions clearly and meaningfully to students.

Standard 27 Student Diagnosis, Achievement and Evaluation

Each candidate identifies students' prior attainments, achieves significant instructional objectives, and evaluates the achievements of the students in a class.

Category V

Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 28 Cognitive Outcomes of Teaching

Each candidate improves the ability of students in a class to evaluate information, think analytically, and reach sound conclusions.

Standard 29 Affective Outcomes of Teaching

Each candidate fosters positive student attitudes toward the subjects learned, the students themselves, and their capacity to become independent learners.

Standard 30 Capacity to Teach Diverse Students

Each candidate demonstrates compatibility with, and ability to teach students who are different from the candidate. The differences between students and the candidate should include ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic and socio-economic differences.

Standard 31 Professional Obligations

Each candidate adheres to high standards of professional conduct, cooperates effectively with other adults in the school community, and develops professionally through self-assessment and collegial interactions with other members of the profession.

Standard 32 Determination of Candidate Competence

Prior to recommending each candidate for a teaching credential, one or more persons who are responsible for the program determine, on the basis of thorough documentation and written verification by at least one supervising teacher and one institutional supervisor, that the candidate has satisfied each Standard in Category V. The institution determines that each candidate has attained Standards 22 through 30 as they relate to the teaching of (a) subjects to be authorized by the credential, and (b) communication skills including reading.